

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/015,865	12	2/12/2001	Ronald A. Sartschev		2596	
7:	590	02/26/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
Legal Departr	nent		PHAN, TI	PHAN, THANH S		
Teradyne, Inc.						
321 Harrison A	venue			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Boston, MA 02118				2841		
				DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/015,865	SARTSCHEV ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Thanh S Phan	2841					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	••				
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed rs will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communic D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ation.				
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
		action is non-final.						
	·							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.						
Applicati	on Papers							
9)□ :	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10) 🔲	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) objected to by the I	Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•	` '	٠				
11\□ .	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcting the oath or declaration is objected to by the Extended to be the Extended			• •				
		aminer, Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152	£.				
_	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage					
Attachment								
2) 🔲 Notice 3) 🔯 Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date 2/11/02 and4/22/03.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/015,865

Art Unit: 2841

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 4, line 4, applicant should clarify what the coincidence reflects. It appears that the claim is incomplete.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarschev et al. [6,073,259] in view of Chu [4,164,648] and Murakami [5,872,745].

Regarding claims 1, 9-10, 12 and 18-19, Sarschev et al. disclose a time measurement circuit are use within automatic test equipment comprising a clock signal [116]; a plurality of delay elements [212(0)-212(16)] forming a delay chain having an input [figure 2a] connected to the clock wherein each of the element having a tap [DO] to select the output of each delay element.

Sarschev et al. disclose every claimed except for the use of a second plurality of delay elements each having an input and output coupled to the stop input and a coincidence circuit having a first plurality of inputs each coupled to one of the taps and a second plurality of inputs each coupled to the output of one of the second plurality of delay and an output with the output representing the coincidence between one of the taps and one of the outputs of the second plurality of delay elements.

Chu discloses the use of a vernier type control circuit for regulating a timing sequence comparing the outputs of multiple delay elements [column 6, lines 11-43].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the delay element structure of Chu for the system of Sarschev in order to sequence the chip testing operation.

Murakami discloses the use of a coincidence circuit [112] comparing the outputs of a plurality of signals obtained through different stages of delay buffers [105] for carrying out zero detection based output values.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the coincidence circuit design of Murakami with the outputs derived from measurement circuit of Sarschev et al., as modified, in order to detect defects in the automated test.

Regarding claims 2-5 and 14, Murakami discloses the coincidence circuit utilizing a plurality column circuits and logic circuits comparing the outputs connected to the taps to reflect coincidence of the inputs [column 1, line 63-column 2, line 15].

Application/Control Number: 10/015,865

Art Unit: 2841

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use comparison technique of Murakami in Sarschev et al., as modified, for purpose of providing indication of a defect.

Regarding claims 6-7, Murakami further discloses the use of a comparison circuit to compare the outputs of the delay element outputs [column 2, lines 16-24].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use comparison technique of Murakami in Sarschev et al., as modified, for the purpose of controlling the timing sequence.

Regarding claims 8 and 15, Sarschev et al. discloses a calibration circuit [226] and storage means therefor [column 5, lines 34-48].

Regarding claims 11 and 13 Sarschev et al. discloses the use of a delay locked loop controlling the output of the delay line [column 4, line 66-column 5, line 10].

Regarding claims 16-17 and 20, Sartschev et al. disclose the measurement circuit implemented on a CMOS chip [figure 3].

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ichimiya et al. [US 4402081]; Staiger [US 5,479,415]; Zhevnerov [US 4,104,590].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh S Phan whose telephone number is 571-272-2109. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 2841

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David S Martin can be reached on 571-272-2107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

tsp

DAVID MARTIN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800